

What are George Bowering, Peter London, David McKeen and Michael Sheldon doing in the gallery?

Vol. 1, Number 19
February 5, 1970

published by
the information
office
sir george
williams
university

SGWU ISSUES & EVENTS



Discussing creativity.

Sheldon: I am acting as moderator or straight man of this discussion on "Have you got a good course in creativity?" or "What is the value of original works as a university function?" I suppose my justification for this is that I am trying to teach a course in creative writing and I have written a little myself. With me are David McKeen of the English department, George Bowering, also of the English department, who is a novelist and poet, and Peter London of the Fine Arts department, who has exhibited in both New York and Montreal. There is a group of basic questions I would like to throw to my companions here; the fundamental one is what can a course in creativity, if you like that word, or original work, achieve in a university setting; is there any value to the student and what sort of value is it? Into that I will throw a remark that Mordecai Richler made when he was teaching creative writing here last year that the whole thing is just a group therapy session. In passing I would also mention that I suspect there is a difference in the writing side as opposed to art or music. Perhaps having muddled the waters a bit I might ask David McKeen to clear them up.

McKeen: I can't clear them up for you, Michael, because I've seen only the unfortunate results of courses in creative writing. I'm what I take it is called a straight academic and rather resent the division which is created in our department, at any rate, between academic work and creative work. I'll give you an example of the kind of thing I mean. A student will come to me and say she is going to do an essay on Shakespeare. Then she'll say "Will you tolerate any creative writing in it?", which to me is an unanswerable question. I'll ask her for a specimen of creative writing and it will turn out to be an imaginative walk with the fool on the heath in King Lear. That doesn't seem to me to have anything to do with creative writing as it's specified in our calendar and localized in certain courses. It has to do with imagination which ought to be part of her critical approach.

Sheldon: George, do you find you have a different definition on this?

Bowering: As a matter of fact I find the term "creative writing" a little stupid because I really don't see why you should call a poem that somebody has written "creative" and an essay that somebody has written "not creative". In other words I don't really have any difference in criteria in terms of my own writing, and when I'm doing a creative writing course I don't tell them that you can do this and you can't do that.

Sheldon: You let them do anything they like, they do their own thing entirely...

Bowering: Yes, I suppose they do their own thing but I'm kind of a proselytizer for certain views in poetry, so what I am doing in the course is a combination of showing them what they're doing bad and proselytizing for a certain view of how to keep poetry good.

Sheldon: What about in prose?

Bowering: Well, nominally I am teaching the poetry course, but on the other hand I have never been able to find a different set of requirements on my own imagination in poetry and prose so that the boundaries break down pretty swiftly.

Sheldon: I gather, Peter, that in the Fine Arts department this word "creative" is pretty well banned anyway, and you take a different approach. How would you fit the student as a creative or original individual into an academic program?

London: The problem is really how you fit the large term, the behavioural term, "creative" into an academic program when you have an institution which has a course-type structure, which has a set pattern of grading - not even evaluation, just grading, when you have certain prerequisites, when you have certain standards of behaviour in modes of thinking, when you have a range of conceptual tools that are permissible and not permissible, then you are really operating not in the full term of creativity but you

are simply miming an accepted momentary pattern of what the creative person ought to be like. And so, in answer to the question what does the Fine Arts department do, probably no different than any other department, whether it's the Business Administration section or the Engineering section. We teach our people, I guess, the rules, the regulations and the formulas for looking creative, making a creative-looking product which is very far from what a creative human being is all about.

Sheldon: Do you think there is any harm, then, to a truly creative person going through this kind of a mill? Do you think they are much better to stay away from Fine Arts and English and things of this sort and become engineers and chemists and trust to God their creativity will come out somewhere else?

London: You can become a poet, a novelist, a painter, a graphic artist, and so on, but you need not go to a school of this kind to do so. The techniques that one picks up are fairly easy techniques; any person here in our school after three or four years has the technical skills to paint any painting that has ever been painted. But what they don't have is the human quality which can conceive of that thing. And this latter part is something that is not developed by an institution of this kind, and there's the difficulty. I would say that the people I have known who have succeeded as artists - that is, as an artist as a human being - are those that have left the school or have been forced to leave the school.

Sheldon: Do you have parallel experience, George, on the writing side?

Bowering: As I remember, the best three or four students I have had in a writing course have all left school and I have known a number of students that have been publishing and writing good poetry and most of them have left school. One thing I didn't mention before that's always been one of my hobbyhorses is

continued on page 2

SGWU appears before Council of Universities

Representatives of SGWU appeared before the Council of Universities in Quebec on Thursday, January 29 to give their reaction to a financing formula that is being considered by the Council, and present the University's case for its grant for the 1970-71 academic year. The SGWU representatives were Professors Jack Bordan and J.P. Pétolas, and Roland Alwin, accounting supervisor.

The formula, based on a January sub-committee report to the Council, would provide the University with a grant of \$12,200,000. A previous sub-committee report submitted last November would have provided a grant of \$14,400,000. Our grant for the current academic year is \$7,700,000.

Several of the other universities protested bitterly at the effect of the new formula. Since it gives us an increase in our grant of more than 50 per cent over the current year, there was no question of SGWU lodging a protest. However, our representatives made a strong case for the special financial support we will need in the coming year, notably with regard to the renting of additional space.

It should be noted that there is no commitment by the government to accept either the formula or its results. Both the formulas that have been discussed in the press were proposals of its subcommittee to the Council of Universities, which is an advisory body reporting to the Minister of Education. The Council still has to make a report to the Minister, and that report has to be considered and accepted by the government. It will therefore probably be another two or three weeks before the final grants for 1970-71 are announced to the universities.



Peter London

George Bowering



Michael Sheldon

"We are making a creative-looking product, which is far from what a creative human being is all about."

that I don't believe in the term "creativity". I don't use the term "creative writing" because I don't believe that that's what a writer does, to begin with. I think that he is more or less somebody who arranges or collects materials. So that when I am working in the class, what I am doing a lot of the time is teaching about the language, exposing models and exposing what people such as Ezra Pound have said about poetry. The whole business of the creative person being stuck in an institution doesn't make much sense to me. I know in my own experience I learned a lot more about writing from an "academic" professor than I ever did from the creative writing course I took.

McKeen: I have a question I would like to ask directly to you, George, because obviously we agree on much of this. I have never understood what is achieved in a course labelled "creative writing" by students actually writing and having their own work criticized, that couldn't be achieved by a more academic approach with the students studying the work of an artist whom we have all acknowledged, let's say Shakespeare, and the work of an Elizabethan hack whose work is only a museum piece today: we no longer read it, it can't move us, it probably didn't move its original audience. Is there any critical approach that can be taken to the so-called creative?

Bowering: I think that sometimes the area between collapses to a certain extent. For instance, I've found in various other kinds of similar experiences that I could learn, literally, a lot more about, say, a poem that I've maybe read 25 times, or a poem that I've just seen, by actually typing it out, having to slow down and type it out. What I do is kind of an extension of that process, bringing to bear normal critical standards that you would find in a survey course. A discussion may be even as far out in left field as printing, a discussion of linguistics which is generally my approach to the language and to writing myself. I don't know if this will answer your question but I think that probably if a person takes any normal course in criticism in the university he is very likely to be offered only a portion of that range, maybe something that revolves around the use of metaphor and allusion and so on and so forth, and not be exposed to the actual workings of the language because that would be relegated to, say, a linguistics course. I am not really here to support creative writing courses per se. I mean it doesn't matter to me whether there is one or not, because I am going

to be talking to students anyway. But even the students that I don't think are going to be very good poets learn a lot about poetry in that context.

Sheldon: Does this mean that there is a basic value for the student in being forced to produce something?

Bowering: Well, that's funny because I've mentioned many, many times to people that I took a number of creative writing courses while I was doing a history major in my first degree in university before I switched into massive English, and really the only thing that I got out of my creative writing courses, although I don't think my teachers were anywhere as good as I am, was that I was forced to turn in some work every week. So I had to sit down and write every day and I didn't sit around and wait for the muse to tap me on the shoulder.

Sheldon: The real purpose of the teacher then is just to keep people working—a taskmaster—and get his own individuality or personality out of it, which I suspect is the danger.

Bowering: I agree with a heck of a lot of teachers of this sort. I agree with Clark Blaise, for instance, who does a prose writing course, that the first work that we do, and probably the most important, is to show people who think that they're doing something original to not be so lazy and to quit doing those stupid things that they're doing, and show them that every 18 year old kid you've ever seen has those sentiments and those tricks and that ignorance, and then say "Look, it might take you six or seven years or you might never discover these key books and poems. I can show you these books and talk about them, and you'll maybe cut that time down to something like six months."

Sheldon: This could be a bit of hothouse process though, couldn't it? I mean you'd be forcing maturity too quickly if they don't find the books by themselves, or find the sources of thought by themselves.

Bowering: I don't think so because I also believe that if I give them a little blast that's only...well, maybe I talk about three writers—those three writers are going to associate in their minds with all kinds of stuff that they learn after that. I never heard anything about say, Louis Zukofsky, in any writing course that I was ever in but I happened to be given a book that opened things out to me, one book of poems, that I am still finding the associations from.

Sheldon: Peter, do you find a parallel

in the presentation of art to the student, broadening their sense of experience?

London: Our method operates on a different basis, it seems. It is organized around allowing the students to come up with an initial product and then, from that, criticizing it and then from that going on to the next thing that a person has, and in the light of what they have done and in the light of the criticism—both a given criticism and then the tacit criticism of simply seeing their work in relation to other people's work in the group and outside the group... and so it progresses supposedly along that basis. We have no real methodology nor even any theory; I think it's basically "Well, get in there and do what you're doing and with my critical eye I'll look at it and I'll tell you what I think", and supposedly after an accumulation of three or four years of this kind of thing one becomes hopefully not simply a better painter but a more creative artist. I don't mind myself using the term "creative" because in our taking it for granted we have really neglected it; and what we have in effect done is simply to train painters and sculptors who were able to do a passable piece and not developed a creative individual. There are characteristics of a creative individual which would be repelled by not only this department but by the school in general, because it is a department and because it is a school.

Sheldon: To a certain extent it is teachers teaching teachers teaching teachers...

McKeen: Not admittedly so.

Sheldon: Not admittedly so, but it is one of the dangers.

Bowering: McLuhan says that's what eventually everybody is going to be doing anyway.

London: We, I think, fall into a difficulty that need not be. When we hire our own graduates to perpetuate our own vision, that is a bad kind of policy. Someway you have to break into that system by allowing other people from other geographic areas to come in and to say "This is how I view the universe." And the interchange of that is so much more fruitful than if everybody sort of agrees that this is the Quebec vision which is hard edge, cool, recessed, that kind of thing, that is simply reinforcing as "ism" and doesn't get you anywhere.

McKeen: Something is emerging here that relates to what both of you have said and where I quite properly sit on the other side

of the table from you. A little anecdote: a sad little neighbour of my mother's years ago, when she learned that I was going to get a senior degree in arts, was terribly disappointed. She thought I was getting educated, by which she thought that I was going to become a dentist. She didn't know how to accept it, so when I came home on holiday and she met me, she said "Oh, it's all right, we need artists." Now, there is a misapprehension about the meaning of arts as we use it in the academic world, but perhaps it's not only vulgar, because I think that both of you are implying that every man can be an artist in some definable, categorizable way through the medium at which he works—words, sculpture, and so on. Therefore both of you are saying, a better artist, a better writer, not such a bad poet. I guess that my notion of these things is very different because it seems to me that the man is an artist or he isn't. To bring it down to a practical question about the role of the creative writing course in our university, does every student who enters such a course get led to think that if he sticks to the course, accepts the criticisms, tries and tries and tries again, he finally will have something new and truthful to say?

Sheldon: I don't think so.

McKeen: I think one should be clear, because they do. Kids will come along and trot out the fact that they've had three creative writing courses and thus they write.

London: Well, how can they help but feel that way. It gives them some hope. I think if they were realistic, it would be the real existential of fear and trembling. We don't develop that thing at all, here. We're really, to a good deal, a mill, and with this B.A. or with this master's or with this whatever it is, you are qualified. Well that is silly, but we take the B.A. to mean qualified artist. Nothing to do with it. The B.A. is one thing and an artist is another thing.

Bowering: I would think that is the trouble with the business of the university. I get academic students who sort of let me know that they feel because they have spent their three or four years at the university, because they have shown up most of the time, because they actually read the textbook, that they should be able to go out and say "O.K., I have been mutated" or something like that.

Sheldon: At least we haven't gone so far as taking a novel and assuming it's worth



David McKeen

an M.A. or a Ph.D.

McKeen: I direct a graduate program and student after student will write to me and say "In lieu of any study of the literature of the Renaissance, the 17th century, and the 18th century will you accept the short story which I published in ...", you know, some minor southern American university student publication.

Bowering: I am totally opposed to... well, for instance, there was a suggestion last year that we have a writing school, a retreat or something in the summer, and I was co-opted for this committee, and I just said there is only one instance in which I would agree with it and that would be if you had a very, very particularized, prejudiced group of writers who all liked each other and all wanted to push a certain thing; otherwise all you are going to have is some kind of public relations bid or a holiday for teachers or something like that. I feel roughly the same way about theses. I don't want to see a creative writing department that offers a degree, ever.

Sheldon: That's a monstrosity.

Bowering: And I don't want to see a novel offered as a thesis. I am totally opposed to that. I'm not really opposed to there being some writing classes, simply because I think that if - what do they call them now? - the resource person is there and somebody really does want to expand his imagination in that way... Well, for instance, the best poets I have had in these classes read a lot more poetry of all periods than almost any academic student I have seen. But I don't care whether or not the course is even offered for credit. And I really think that you can really mess people up if you let them take, say, twelve credits in creative writing. Unless you force them to do that as it's done in some graduate schools in creative writing, for instance at Oregon, which insists that the student get just as many credits in academic courses in addition to his creative writing credits.

McKeen: But if the courses are there faute de mieux then the better would be - resource personnel is an awful term - to have people around who would welcome students who did have something that they had written to show them, who would welcome a kind of friendly relationship between them.

Bowering: Yes, for me this would mean that I would take, say, a regular number of courses teaching academic - the same number of courses as everybody else - plus an additional class of students that

I wanted there from having seen their work and who really wanted to do the stuff.

McKeen: Right, out of interest rather than...

Bowering: So just as a student could do that writing business in addition to all his academic work, I would do the same thing. Which I always have one. And I do it in addition to my writing classes now, anyway. I probably see more ex-students or non-students than I do students in class.

Sheldon: Do you think there's a danger, in doing this within our academic framework, that the teacher forms the student along his or her own lines rather than letting him develop just in his own interest? I mean this forming of a school, this forming of a type of writing, this presentation of favorite masters...

Bowering: No, I think that's my job, I think I should do that. I think also that somebody else should do the other thing. For instance Clark Blaise and I agree on a few writers and we're very friendly about other things. But in terms of what kind of writing we like, we diverge almost all the time, especially in poetry. And I say let him push as far as he possibly can at his view and let me push as far as I possibly can at mine.

Sheldon: And you don't see any harm coming to the student because there are these one or two strong streams?

Bowering: No, I was exposed to one primarily for a long time and finally moved over into another school.

London: I would object strongly to that point of view. We had an occasion here to have an instructor who had great charisma and a very clear point of view, and we found that the students followed this very, very clearly; at least they followed it in all signs that we can notice - painting in a similar fashion. But when this person left they stopped painting in that fashion, they didn't know where to go. And then we asked them "What is the source of your imagery? How is the visual thing that you present to us a representation in some way of your being in the world?" Well, they were never asked this kind of question before, it seems. And therefore it seems that the origin of their art was taken from the persuasive ability, by verbal and non-verbal means, of some source outside of themselves, and they took it whole. I think this puts a person on such a weak foundation and in the end develops nothing that is of interest to the society. What seems to be of interest is a unique and personal insight into the world. We don't need more of the lecturer's insight, what we need are other insights. The only way to develop that kind of thing, it seems, is to pay heed to a germinal thing and to nurture that. In an academic setting one is overwhelmed by the charisma and ability of an older professional, to the point where he never raises the fundamental existential questions which are, it seems to me, the only ones which are of importance for the arts.

Bowering: I think that if this is true then there is something wrong with those students and/or there is something wrong with the business of having huge classes.

London: But these were not huge classes, those were ten or fifteen people in a classroom and these were the brightest people in the department. The most gifted of them wanted to make it, you know.

Bowering: I can't read anything from any writer or artist or musician who doesn't live in the middle of contention. Ezra Pound is the example I always come back to. But this has happened in other ways too. At one time I was totally enamoured of Ernest Hemingway and I could have come to that point you said the students come to and be stuck with Hemingway for the rest of my life. But I just began to get involved in certain problems that Hemingway didn't seem to get beyond. And now I

"I teach the encounter between me and Shakespeare.

As soon as students start understanding what this means their little essays are creative writing."

read Hemingway as kind of amusing - something to do - but he is not on the same side of the contention that I feel I'm on. If the person doesn't espouse very strong feelings about the direction of his art, all he is going to do is to show you what colours go together, something like that.

London: Oh, sure, but he should not be a proselytizer of his particular vision; he can't help it in one way, but if he reinforces that kind of thing by active proselytizing then the students themselves don't have the ammunition to counter that kind of barrage.

Bowering: Well, my creative writing teachers were in the enemy camp, and that just didn't happen to me.

McKeen: Do you see something rather positive about the academic who is the establishment kind of academic, and I take it that I'm regarded as such here? One says, in a kind of shorthand, I teach Shakespeare, but in fact one only uses that kind of shorthand among people who already know that there's something far more complicated than that going on in the classroom. I teach the encounter between me and Shakespeare. As soon as students start understanding what this means I think that their little essays are creative writing. If they start with the effect that the work had on them - that is the only sure point...

Bowering: Of all my teachers I learned more about writing from a "straight" academic teacher at UBC than from any writer, except in terms of reading books.

McKeen: And what students are supposed to be learning is to first identify and then try to articulate their encounter.

Bowering: So, you're doing something that's not much different from what I am doing.

Sheldon: They both strike me as being entirely unacademic, in the accepted term.

McKeen: Is that right?

Sheldon: It seems to me that the academic approach is essentially a provision of knowledge, of critical values, so that

ultimately the person can present their own values if they feel like it.

McKeen: Well, one does that simultaneously, I suppose. I always try to tell a really good student who I think is going somewhere to leave out the encounter between him and the work; it's the all-important part of the paper but it never gets written, it's chapter zero. Then tie first section of the paper in his reconstruction of how the work affected him, which in fact is talking about the effect of devices in the work, which ends up looking like straight academic criticism.

Sheldon: Though indeed it's more personal.

Bowering: I almost always advise a student wondering about what to take in school to ignore the name of the course and go to the guy who you want as teacher. Because you can find out more that way. And then you are going to be able to come at that other confrontation with the work, that other part of the triangle, I guess.

Sheldon: Aren't you in danger there of creating fan clubs?

McKeen: Oh, you are.

Bowering: You are, but there is a difference between a good teacher and a popular teacher. Often they are the same thing.

London: Perhaps the calendar, then, should be written with the names of the instructors and a brief biography that each one writes. And the student then chooses the person.

Sheldon: You are getting back to those student-oriented course guides.

London: That's right. And our people do pick their instructors rather than the course. There is no reason to take one painting course rather than another. We just call our courses painting, drawing, sculpture and graphics; there is really not very much subject matter there. The subject matter is how one human being perceives the universe, and by understanding that one can see where one overlaps or where one doesn't. That is the learning.

Review Student Representation

At its meeting on Friday, January 30, University Council approved a two-part motion arising out of 1967 decision to review student participation in academic government after a two-year period: 1) present arrangements for such participation will continue for one more academic year. 2) a committee of evaluation will be set up to report to the May meeting of University Council. The committee will be composed of two students appointed from their own number by the present four student members of University Council; one student appointed by the Stu-

dents' Association; one student appointed by the Evening Students' Association; one student appointed by the Graduate Students' Association; five faculty members, two appointed by the Arts Faculty Council, and one each by the Science, Commerce and Engineering Faculty Councils. University Council also approved the appointment of Dr. Stanley French as Interim Chairman of the Board of Graduate Studies, and Professors F.W. Bedford and William S. Lewis as Faculty members of the Athletics Council.

THE WEEK AT SGWU

Send notices and photos of coming events to the Information Office, room 211 of the Norris Building, or phone 879-2867. Deadline for submission is noon **Wednesday** for the following week's events.

MONDAY 9

CHANNEL 4: "Communications and Society" - a series of videotaped lectures by Prof. Charles Siepmann, N.Y.U.; this week "Growing up in America" at 10, 10:30 a.m., 2 and 2:30 p.m. through Friday; may be viewed in individual carrels located in H-523.

GALLERY I: Works of Gary Coward until February 14.

WEISSMAN GALLERY: Yves Gaucher - Graphics '57 to '67, until February 14.

SMALL GALLERY: Posters from Three Wars until February 16.

WINTER CARNIVAL: Parade at 1 p.m. from Dominion Square to the Hall Building; The Chambers Brothers, Lighthouse, and comedian Bob Kosser at Place des Arts, 7 p.m. and 10 p.m., tickets \$3.50 - \$5.50.

POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT: Prof. Saul N. Silverman of the University of Prince Edward Island speaks on "Concepts in Political Science" in H-435 at 9.50 a.m., and on "Soviet System and Administration" in H-607 at 3:45 p.m.

FINE ARTS DEPARTMENT: NFB films in H-110 from 1 to 3 p.m.

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY: NFB films "Ladies and Gentlemen... Mr. Leonard Cohen" and "The Back-Breaking Leaf" at 3:45 and 8:30 p.m. in H-937; free, all are invited.

TUESDAY 10

WINTER CARNIVAL: Afternoon mezzanine dance with hot Mexican food and tequila; pub crawl at 6:30 p.m. finishing at Boulevard de Paris with two bands going all night (applications at Carnival office, H-355).

FINE ARTS DEPARTMENT: NFB films in H-435 from 1 to 3 p.m.

WEDNESDAY 11

WINTER CARNIVAL: Sports forum with Expos, Alouettes and Voyageurs in H-110 from 1 to 4 p.m.

GEORGIAN FILM SOCIETY: Mini-Festival with Raymond Massey in H.G. Wells' "The Shape of Things to Come" (1936) at 1:05 p.m.; and Laurel & Hardy in "Blockheads" (1938) at 2:45 p.m.; both for 25c in H-110.

FINE ARTS DEPARTMENT: NFB films in H-635 from 1 to 3 p.m.

THEATRE: Student productions "Riders to the Sea" and "Questions" through Saturday at 8:30 p.m.; free admission.

THURSDAY 12

WINTER CARNIVAL: "The Thomas Crown Affair" with Steve McQueen at 1 p.m. in H-110 (free); car rally at 4 p.m. from Place Portobello, Ville Brossard, to the Nest Egg (entry fee \$3); SGWU vs Laval for hockey's Coupe de Québec at the Forum at 8 p.m.; night out at the Nest Egg from 7 p.m. to 1 a.m. \$1 per couple.

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT: Colloquium with McGill's John Macnamara on "Psycholinguistic Experiments on Meaning" in H-520 at 4 p.m.

CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART: Start of a D.W. Griffith festival in H-110 with lectures throughout by Raymond Rohauer, curator of the New York Cultural Center - "Abraham Lincoln" (1930, sound) with Walter Huston, Jason Robars and Helen Freeman at 7 p.m.; "Birth of a Nation" (1915, music track) with Lillian Gish, Mae Marsh, Donald Crisp, H.B. Walthall and Miriam Cooper at 9 p.m. (On evenings when two films are presented the price at 7 p.m. for both shows is \$1.00 for students, \$1.50 for non students - tickets will not be sold for the 7 p.m. show only; price for the 9 p.m. show only is 50c for students, 75c for non-students).

BOARD OF GOVERNORS: Meeting in H-769 at 1 p.m.

FINE ARTS DEPARTMENT: NFB films in H-435 from 1 to 3 p.m.

Science Faculty

Appointments

Assistant Dean J.R. Ufford will serve as Acting Dean of the Faculty of Science from June 1, 1970 to May 31, 1971. Professor F.W. Bedford will serve as Acting Assistant Dean during the same period.

These appointments are occasioned by the absence or leave of Dean Samuel Madras.

Seminar Week Feb. 23 - 25

Classes will be cancelled in both day and evening divisions February 23 to 25 for Seminar Week, a University Council-approved innovation this year.

Day or evening graduate classes are to be held at the discretion of the instructor.

Student associations of the various Faculties are responsible for programs held during Seminar Week; they should be contacted for further information.

FRIDAY 13

DAY CLASSES CANCELLED

WINTER CARNIVAL: Ski day at Bromont also with ski-dooing, sleigh rides, skating, broomball, hockey, folksinging, and dancing; ground fees \$1, day and night tow ticket \$1.50, evening entertainment \$1, buses from Sir George \$2.

BASKETBALL: University of Sherbrooke vs. Sir George at Loyola, 8:30 p.m.

COMMERCE FACULTY COUNCIL: Meeting in H-769 at 2 p.m.

CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART: D.W. Griffith's "Dream Street" (1921, silent) with Tyrone Power, Carol Dempster and Ralph Graves at 7 p.m.; "Broken Blossoms" (1919, music track) with Lillian Gish, Donald Crisp and Richard Barthelmess at 9 p.m. in H-110.

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT: John Freccero, professor of Italian in Yale's department of Romance languages, speaks on "BLOW-UP, from Word to Image" at 8:30 p.m. in H-651; those interested in the lecture are invited to a free screening of "Blow-Up" at 4 p.m. in H-520.

GERMAN DEPARTMENT: Films "Germany's Living Heritage", "To See is Everything" and "Berlin Guestbook" at 7:30 p.m. in H-921.

SATURDAY 14

WINTER CARNIVAL: Carnival Ball 8:30 p.m. at Hotel Bonaventure with Theodore's Smoke Shop and the One Track Mind, door prizes include a Caribbean cruise for two; \$4.50 per semi-formally dressed couple.

CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART: D.W. Griffith's "Isn't Life Wonderful?" (1924, silent) with Lionel Barrymore, Neil Hamilton and Carol Dempster at 7 p.m. in H-110; "The Struggle" (1931, sound) with Hal Skelly, Zita Johann and Edna Hagan at 9 p.m.

SUNDAY 15

MASS: 11:30 a.m. at 2185 Bishop.

CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART: D.W. Griffith's "Sally of the Sawdust" (1925, silent) with W.C. Fields, Carol Dempster and Alfred Lunt at 7 p.m.; "Way Down East" (1920, music track) with Lillian Gish, Richard Barthelmess and Creighton Hale at 9 p.m. in H-110.

CHANNEL 9: "Can you all hear at the back?" with NYU's Charles Siepmann and James B. Conant discussing the comprehensive high school, and a French 211 language lab exercise at 1 p.m. on Cable TV.



Is "Hit the Road, Shameful Wretch!" the hit song from D.W. Griffith's "Broken Blossoms"? Find out when the Conservatory of Cinematographic Art presents a Griffith festival February 12-16.

Cancel Day Classes Feb. 13

Winter Carnival's ski day, with sundry entertainments, will be held Friday, February 13. All day division classes are cancelled with the exception of laboratories or any classes meeting on Friday only. Evening classes will be held as usual.

SGWU ISSUES & EVENTS

SGWU ISSUES & EVENTS is published weekly by the Information Office of Sir George Williams University, Montreal. The editorial offices are located in room 211 of the Norris Building, 1435 Drummond Street, Montreal 107, Quebec. Telephone 879-2867.

Michael Sheldon
Malcolm Stone
Joel McCormick